



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,362	04/30/2001	Dennis Frank Haynes	RSW920010084US1	3164
7590	04/04/2005		EXAMINER	
JACK FRIEDMAN, ESQ SCHMEISER OLSON AND WATTS 3 LEAR JET LANE, SUITE 201 LATHAM, NY 12110			GARG, YOGESH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/845,362	HAYNES ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Yogesh C Garg	3625

*--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

THE REPLY FILED 09 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
 2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
 (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
 (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
 6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
 7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_.

  
 Yogesh C Garg  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit: 3625

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments, though fully considered are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the reference Henson falls short of teaching claims 1-2 and 19-20 because Henson does not suggest that the server changes the attribute of the secondary item in response to the change in the attribute of the primary item. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Henson, see col.15, lines 31-45, teaches that when a shopper decides a different computer system [chassis-which corresponds to a shopper changing the attribute of the primary item in the shopping cart (see at least col.3, lines 12-29 which shows that the shopping commands are implemented on a cart web-page)] the configurator [component of the server] determines this change in the primary item and accordingly identifies the corresponding options [secondary items] linked to the changed computer system [primary item] and presents new options [secondary items] consistent with the changed computer system [primary item]. The configurator on the server offering options [secondary items] after determining the change in the computer system [primary item] satisfies the fact that the server changes the attribute of the secondary item in response to a change in the attribute of a primary item. Henson's teachings of presenting menu of options [secondary items] consistent with the change in the primary item [computer system] is equivalent to soliciting the shopper to authorize the change because in Henson when the shopper selects the option it becomes the authorization and is received by the server (this teaching satisfies the limitations recited in claims 2 and 20). The examiner has considered the applicant's arguments against rejection of claims 13 and 23 but are not persuasive. In view of the above the rejection of claims, as presented in the Final office action, is maintainable..